

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination and search of the subject and for finding allowable subject matter in the present application.

All Claims are believed to be in condition for Allowance, and that is so requested.

Claims 33, 50, and 59 are amended.

Claim 51 is canceled.

The Specification is amended. The second paragraph after the title is amended to update the status of priority patent applications.

Claim 33 is objected to because of an informality. The base claim referred to in Claim 33 was originally shown as "33." That reference number was incorrect. It is now amended to "32." Please reconsider this claim in light of the amendment.

Claim 59 is objected to because of an informality. The term "injecting" in original Claim 59 did not have antecedent basis in the base claim (50). To correct this error, the base claim reference is now amended to "55." Please reconsider this claim in light of the amendment.

Claims 50 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takaya et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,060,350). The Examiner has found allowable subject matter in Claims 51 and 53-64 per item five (page 3 of present action). In light of this finding, Applicant now amends base claim Claim 50 to add the limitation of original Claim 51. This addition should place Amended Claim 50 in condition for allowance. Claim 51 is canceled as now redundant. Claims 52-64 should be in condition

for allowance, again based on the Examiner's comment under item five.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas R. Schnabel Reg. No. 47,927